The University of Chicago

# DANCING AND PANTOMIME ON THE ENGLISH STAGE, 1700–1737

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
1933

By
EMMETT LANGDON AVERY

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
Studies in Philology
Vol. XXXI, No. 3, 1934

The University of Chicago

# DANCING AND PANTOMIME ON THE ENGLISH STAGE, 1700–1737

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

1933

By

EMMETT LANGDON AVERY

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
Studies in Philology
Vol. XXXI, No. 3, 1934

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

# DANCING AND PANTOMIME ON THE ENGLISH STAGE, 1700–1737

By Emmett L. Avery

It is a well-known fact that the London theaters of the early eighteenth century presented to their audiences a diversity of dramatic types. Besides the regular comedies and tragedies, there developed such forms of theatrical fare as the Italian and ballad operas, which competed with the regular dramas. In addition, there were other types, generally referred to as "entertainments," which were frequently presented between the acts and at the conclusion of the play and which were in theory supplementary to the play, although they often seemed to dominate it. Included in these entertainments were such diverse elements as songs, dialogues, interludes of vocal and instrumental music, acrobatic acts, imitations, exhibitions of strange human beings or animals, individual and group dances, and pantomimes, the latter usually being presented as afterpieces. It is with the history and nature of dancing and pantomime that this study is concerned.

Many of these types were not new to the stage, for some of them, like the songs and dances, had been presented frequently in connection with plays during the Renaissance and Restoration periods; others, like the pantomimes, did not develop fully until the early decades of the eighteenth century. Not all of these types of entertainment were welcomed by those who wished to uphold the dignity of the stage. Their presence on the stage, especially as they appeared to grow in popularity with the audiences, led to lamentations over the increasing degeneracy of the stage and of the audience, lamentations which frequently give some suggestions of the nature and popularity of these diversions. In 1702, for instance, an author published anonymously a long dialogue by three characters, Ramble and Sullen, two gentlemen, and Chagrin, a critic, who not only indicated in considerable detail what was being presented at that time but also gave a forecast of what the future was likely to be:

> *Ramb.* . . . and as you have been moralizing on the management of their Plays, I'll have a touch at their *Singing* and *Dancing*. . . .
>
> *Crit.* Well remembred i'faith: If we had left out these unnatural Ornaments, we had rob'd em of their chief Support; 'tis the very staple Commodity of the Stage.

*Ramb.* I'gad the Arguments mine, and I'll have it. Ha, ha, ha: Why its one of the pleasantest Farces they have, and many a damnable Play has been sav'd by't.

*Crit.* 'Tis ridiculous enough of all Conscience that the Poets Wit shou'd lye in the Dancers Heel; it gives me a sort of non-sensical reason why *Pegasus* is said to be the Poets Horse; I perceive 'twas for his activity and capring. . . .

*Sull.* It has always been the Jest of all the Men of Sense about Town; not that the Fellows perform'd ill, for in their way they did admirably; but that the Stage that had kept it's purity a hundred Years (at least from this Debauchery) shou'd now be prostituted to Vagabonds, to Capers, Mimicks, Fidlers, Tumblers, and Gipsies.

*Crit.* Oh, what a charming Sight 'twas to see *Madam*—what a pox d'ee call her—the high German *Buttock*—swim along the Stage between her two Gipsie Daughters: they skated along the Ice so cleaverly, you might have sworn they were of right *Dutch* extraction.

*Sull.* And the *Sieur Allard*—

*Crit.* Ay, the Sieur with a pox to him—and the two *Monsieurs* his Sons—Rogues that show at *Paris* for a Groat a piece, and here they were an entertainment for the Court and his late Majesty.

*Ramb.* Oh—*Harlequin* and *Scaramouch.*

*Crit.* Ay; what a rout there was with a Night Piece of *Harlequin* and *Scaramouch.* With the Guittar and the Bladder! What jumping over Tables and Joint-Stools! What ridiculous Postures and Grimaces! and what an exquisite Trick 'twas to straddle before the Audience, making a thousand damn'd *French* Faces and seeming in Labour with a Monstrous Birth, at last my counterfeit Male Lady is delivered of her two Puppies *Harlequin* and *Scaramouch.*

*Sull.* And yet the Town was so fond of this, that these Rascals brought the greatest House that ever were known.[1]

Lamentations such as these were to be reiterated frequently as during the next forty years the entertainments became a more important part of an evening's program within the theater. During the early decades of the eighteenth century many reasons were advanced to explain the continued growth and popularity of these diversions in the playhouse, and although critics disagreed concerning the causes for the development of entertainments, almost no one denied that they had become an important, although perhaps undesirable, element among the offerings of the theaters. Indeed, to many people interested in the drama, the entertainments seemed frequently to dominate the comedy or tragedy with which they were presented, and among all these lesser dramatic offerings,

[1] *A Comparison between the Two Stages, With an Examen of the Generous Conqueror* (London, 1702), pp. 45-48.

the pantomime was to many the greatest menace to the dignity and welfare of the stage.

Although there were many occasions on which a comedy or tragedy was sufficient to draw an audience, there developed two other types of programs; in these the play was only one of many items on the evening's program. The first of these types included a play supplemented by a variety of short entertainments of singing, dancing, instrumental music, and such novelties as tumbling or rope-dancing. With frequent changes in the songs or dances given between the acts and at the end of the play, this type was often presented. In the advertisements these entertainments sometimes appeared to overshadow the play, and probably they did so at times. As early as June 8, 1703, the advertisement for Lincoln's Inn Fields indicated how the miscellaneous pieces were already dominating the play, which at this performance was *The Fair Penitent:*

With Four Entertainments of Singing (entirely New) by the Famous Segniora *Francesca Margarita de l'Epine*; to which will be added, the Nightingale Song; It being the last time of her Singing whilst she stays in England. The Instrumental Musick Compos'd by Signior *Iacomo Greber*. With a Country Wedding Dance by Monsieur L'Abbé, Mrs. Elford, and others. Also a New Entertainment of Dancing between *Mezetin* a Clown, and two Chair-men. With the Dance of *Blouzabella* by Mr. *Prince* and Mrs. *Elford*. By reason of the Entertainments, the Play will be shortnd.[2]

The second type of program which included more than a play consisted of a play with an afterpiece, with or without the shorter entertainments mentioned above. This type is illustrated by the advertisement for Drury Lane theater for January 1, 1725, when *Don John* and the pantomime called *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* were to be presented; on the same evening the theater in Lincoln's Inn Fields gave *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and another pantomime, *The Necromancer, or Harlequin Doctor Faustus*.[3] Sometimes the program offered a play and two afterpieces, one a pantomime and the other a non-pantomimic piece; Covent Garden, for example, on November 4, 1735, presented *Tamerlane*, the pantomime of *Apollo and Daphne*, and a ballet entitled *The Triumphs of Love*.[4] Even when a play and one or more afterpieces were offered, there

[2] *Daily Courant*, June 8, 1703.
[3] *Ibid*, Jan. 1, 1725.
[4] *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, Nov. 4, 1735.

were likely to be other entertainments of singing and dancing between the acts of the play and between the play and the afterpieces.

Utilizing these two types of programs, the managers of the theaters offered a great number and a considerable variety of individual songs, dances, farces, pantomimes, imitations, acrobatic novelties, musical pieces, and spectacular scenes and machines. Of all these entertainments, however, probably the dances and the pantomimes attracted the most comment, criticism, and satire in their day, and it is to these elements in the entertainments from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the Licensing Act of 1737 that this study is limited.

Much of the stage dancing, especially during the early decades of the century before the pantomime had become firmly established, consisted of short dances given sometimes by individual performers and occasionally by a small group. These, like the novelties, the vocal pieces, and the instrumental music, were usually presented between the acts of the play, possibly at its conclusion as well, and they retained their popularity through the whole period, even after the pantomime came into greater favor. The most important type of stage dancing, however, was the pantomime, in which stories and situations were enacted before the audience by means of dumb show and dancing.

Stage dancing in general was considered by many to be an important part of the stage fare and by some as even a valuable addition to the play itself, although there was some dispute over introducing it into plays. Interest in stage dancing was reflected not only in the number of dances given but also in the theoretical discussions of the subject, in the number of dancing masters [5] and dancers, both English and foreign, and in the comment evoked in the newspapers and magazines. In fact, the dancers, dancing masters, and commentators developed theories and rules for stage dancing. One of the most influential of these theorists was John Weaver, a dancing master who published several books on the theory of dancing and its history, both in the past and in contemporary England.[6]

[5] In the introduction to his *Anatomical and Mechanical Lectures upon Dancing* (London, 1721), Weaver gave a list of the dancing masters who subscribed to the book, a list which contains over thirty names.

[6] Weaver received some attention and approval from the *Spectator*. In No. 334, March 24, 1712, there was published a letter which Weaver

According to Weaver, high qualifications were essential in a good dancing master and a good stage dancer. The first was a knowledge of music:

> It is therefore requisite, for such a Master in our Art, to have, not only an universal Knowledge in *Dancing*, and to apply himself to the Study, and Consideration of all Characters; but also, so much Skill in *Musick*, as, at least, to be able to give Instructions to a Master in *Musick* for the Composition of his Airs; to judge, whether such *Musick* express well his *Ideas*; be justly apply'd to his Design; and well adapted to the characters he would represent.[7]

The second was a knowledge of rhetoric:

> Rhetorick is an Art of Eloquence, which arises from an elegant Choice of Words, perswasive, and of such Force, as so to express the Passions, as to raise, or allay the Affections of Man. What *Rhetorick* is to an *Orator* in Speaking, is to the *Dancer* in Action; and an Elegance of Action consists, in adapting the Gesture to the Passions and Affections; and the *Dancer*, as well as the *Orator*, allures the Eye, and invades the Mind of the Spectator; for there is a Force, an Energy in Action, which strangely affects; and when Words will scarce move, Action will excite, and put all the Powers of the Soul in a Ferment.[8]

The dancer must not only know music and the art of eloquence, but he must present "proper Attitudes," which the dancing master will help to develop in him:

> The *Dancing Master*, as well as the *Painter*, ought to be endued with a Genius capable of expressing the Passions he would represent; and to make the Dumb, as it were, to speak; he ought to give his Performers, as the Painter does his Picture, proper Attitudes, that may be regular, agreeable, and justly contrasted by contrary Motions, and preserve the Body carefully pois'd on its own Center; his Contrast should be always natural; and never extravagant; he ought to be well acquainted with *Ordonnance*, or *Disposition*, that he may be capable of grouping his Performers, or Placing his Dancers (as in a Picture) in a regular, beautiful, and harmonious Order. His principal Performer ought to appear in the principal Light, to distinguish it from the rest; so that it may

---

apparently wrote lamenting the decline of dancing and announcing his own treatise on the history of dancing; in No. 466, August 25, 1712, *The Spectator* commented favorably upon dancing and upon Weaver's book.

[7] John Weaver, *Anatomical and Mechanical Lectures upon Dancing. Wherein Rules and Institutions for that Art are laid down and demonstrated. As they were Read at the Academy in Chancery Lane* (London, 1721), pp. 142-3.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

first catch the Eye; and the rest of the *Dancers* should be as Members to the Action, as growing out of it, and not inserted in it.[9]

In an earlier book, Weaver had discussed also the main kinds of theatrical dancing, the methods and virtues of each type. In general, he divided all stage dancing into three groups to which he gave the names: "Serious, Grotesque, and Scenical."[10] The first two, the serious and grotesque, represent persons, passions, and manners, while the scenical adds to that representation the telling of a story or plot through dancing and dumb show. All three are designed

. . . to explain Things conceiv'd in the Mind, by *Gestures* and *Motions* of the Body, and plainly and intelligibly representing *Actions*, *Manners*, and *Passions*; so that the Spectator might perfectly understand the *Performer* by these his *Motions*, tho' he say not a Word.[11]

The serious and grotesque dances are represented mainly by the individual or group dancing which does not involve a plot; the scenical is represented by the pantomime. Weaver's term "grotesque" was later used rather loosely to refer sometimes to rustic scenes and often to the non-classical parts of the pantomimes.

Apart from the *commedia dell'arte* dances, most of those exhibited on the stage can be classified according to Weaver's grouping of serious and grotesque, leaving the scenical for the pantomime proper. Although these dances were exceedingly numerous, for many of them little evidence of their exact nature has been preserved except what may be conjectured from their titles. There are, of course, the "serious" or relatively formal dances, of which the sarabands and chaconnes are probably representative.[12] For some of these formal dances, technical descriptions exist, of which this account for "Fairbank's Maggot" (performed, for example, in Drury Lane, June 13, 1718)[13] is typical:

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 145-6.

[10] John Weaver, *An Essay Towards an History of Dancing. In which the whole Art and its Various Excellencies are in some Measure explain'd. Containing the several Sorts of Dancing, Antique and Modern, Serious, Scenical, Grotesque, Etc. with the Use of it as an Exercise, Qualification, Diversion, &.* (London, 1712), p. 158.

[11] Weaver, *History of Dancing*, p. 160.

[12] A saraband was performed, for instance, by Miss Younger in Drury Lane, May 13, 1714 (*Daily Courant*, May 13, 1714).

[13] *Daily Courant*, June 13, 1718.

**Each strain twice.**
The first couple lead through the second couple and cast off, then lead thro' the third couple into the second couple's place, and both turn single, then first man cross on the outside of the third woman, and cast round the second woman into the second couple's place at the same time, then right and left, quite round with your second couple, and turn your partner.[14]

Other dances were of a more humorous or "grotesque" vein, of which some were native English or Scotch and some were foreign. Weaver himself, for example, was to "perform *Roger a Coverly* as it was done Originally after the Yorkshire Manner" (Lincoln's Inn Fields, December 29, 1702);[15] in Drury Lane, May 4, 1719, and later, he entertained with his "English Clown" dance.[16] Some which probably were similar in character were "The Country Farmer's Daughter" by the Devonshire Girl (Drury Lane, February 12, 1703)[17] and the "Comic Lass," composed by Newhouse and danced by his pupil, Miss Wherrit (Goodman's Fields, March 6, 1732).[18] The Irish and Scotch were represented too by the Devonshire Girl's "Highland Lilt" (Drury Lane, February 12, 1703),[19] Mrs. Bicknell's "Scotch Dance" (frequently through the early years), and Miss Evans' "Scotch and Irish Dance" (Lincoln's Inn Fields, June 26, 1704).[20]

The visiting foreign dancers, especially the French, brought with them a number of their own dances, some of which were taken over by English performers. Many of these were between a husband and a wife, such as "A French Peasant and his Wife" by Sandham and Miss Santlow (Drury Lane, May 17, 1714),[21] a "French Sailor and his Wife" by Mons. and Mlle. Sallé (Lincoln's Inn

[14] *The Weekly Amusement*, Dec. 7, 1734; in the 1735 edition, I, 118. This periodical has technical descriptions of many other dances, of which the following are a few sometimes performed on the stages: "The Tipling Philosophers," Dec. 28, 1734; "Jack of the Green: or, Birkhead's Masque," Jan. 4, 1735; "Lads and Lasses," Jan. 18, 1735; "Mr. Prince's Scotch Dance," Jan. 25, 1735; and "Floridant," Feb. 15, 1735.

[15] *Daily Courant*, Dec. 28, 1702.

[16] *Ibid.*, May 4, 1719.

[17] *Ibid.*, Feb. 12, 1703.

[18] *Daily Post*, March 6, 1732.

[19] *Daily Courant*, Feb. 12, 1703.

[20] *Ibid.*, June 26, 1704.

[21] *Ibid.*, May 17, 1714.

Fields, November 2, 1725),[22] and a "Country Frenchman and his Wife" by Du Ruel and Mrs. Du Ruel (Drury Lane, June 7, 1704).[23] Possibly these Continental peasant and sailor dances were similar to those which Gregorio Lambranzi described in his book on theatrical dancing, published in 1716.[24] In his foreword Lambranzi pointed out that he had personally performed these dances on the continent, and it is possible that he influenced some of the French dancers:

> In Conclusion, I can assure the reader that I have myself performed these dances in the most distinguished theatres of Germany, Italy, and France, and that nearly all are my own compositions.[25]

The book contained prints and descriptions of specific dances, of which this peasant dance suggests the type which was performed in England:

> This peasant dance is begun by the man alone. At the end of the air the woman enters with a broom, with which she belabours the man and drives him away. Now he comes back and attacks her in turn, but as she vigorously repulses him they achieve a ridiculous dance with these alternate blows and then both run off.[26]

Another is a peasant love dance;[27] and there is also a drunken peasant dance:

> When the curtain is raised this drunken peasant is seen. As the air begins he tries to get up, but falls down several times. At last he staggers to his feet and waves his hand to the tankard of beer, which does not want to come to him. Reeling, he snatches it up, drinks from it thrice, puts it on the ground again, and finishes the strain by staggering backwards and forwards, walking and jumping. At the end he claps on his hat, picks up the tankard and exits tottering from side to side.[28]

---

[22] *Daily Courant*, Nov. 2, 1725.

[23] *Ibid.*, June 4, 1704.

[24] *New and Curious School of Theatrical Dancing. With all the Original Plates by Johann Georg Puschner.* Translated from the German by Derra de Moroda, and edited with a preface by Cyril W. Beaumont (London, 1928).

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[26] *Ibid.*, Part I, Dance 6, pp. 19-20.

[27] *Ibid.*, Part I, Dance 8, p. 20.

[28] Lambranzi, *op. cit.*, Part I, p. 20. In Part II Lambranzi described some dances which pertained to specific crafts or national groups, dances similar probably to those performed in London. Some of these were: Dances No. 3-4, Venetian Merchant and Wife; No. 5-6, Venetian Boatman

The French were not the only people represented in the dances on the English stages. There was the ever popular "Dutch Skipper" which appeared again and again through the decades. The Far East was represented too in "The Grand Agee and his Sultana" by Mons. Sallé and Mrs. Legare (Lincoln's Inn Fields, January 22, 1732)[29] and the South similarly in a "Dance of Ethiopians" by Essex and Lally (Drury Lane, May 9, 1728).[30]

Many other dances differed from those indicated above only in the greater number of performers involved; still others took the form of ballets or groups of dances which Weaver would probably have called "scenical" because of the slight story related in them. One dance illustrating the more elaborate quality of the first type was "The Rover," performed in Drury Lane, January 3, 1736;[31] it combined into one dance many typical characters often found in the single or double dances. The characters were: The Rover, played by Essex; a Flanderkin Woman by Mrs. Walter; a Dutchwoman by Miss Mann; a Peasant Woman by Mrs. Anderson; a Dutchman by Duke; a French Peasant by Davenport; and a group of Dutchmen and their wives by Pelling, Janno, Miss Brett, and Mrs. Davenport. Somewhat similar, apparently, was a "Comic-Ballet" entitled "The Difference of Nations, or the Dancing Europeans" (Goodman's Fields, March 13, 1733)[32] which had in it a Dutch Skipper and his wife; French peasants; Scotch peasants; and English country folk. Others were of a still more unusual character, as, for example, "The Humours of Bedlam," performed frequently in Lincoln's Inn Fields during 1720-1730, where on January 15, 1725,[33] it had six characters: A Mad Scholar (played by Nivelon), a Mad Dancing Master (by Glover), a Mad Gamester (by Pelling), a Mad Taylor (by Newhouse), a Mad Astrologer (by Lanyon), and a Mad Lady (by Mrs. Legare). Another unusual one was "The Dance of Court Cards" (Goodman's Fields, October

and Wife; No. 25, Two Blacksmiths; No. 26, Two Coopers; No. 27-8, A Tailor; No. 29-30, A Cobbler; No. 32, Tennis Players; No. 38, Four Turks; No. 39, Four Negroes.

[29] *Daily Journal*, Jan. 22, 1732.

[30] *Daily Post*, May 9, 1728.

[31] *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, Jan. 3, 1736.

[32] *Daily Post*, March 13, 1733.

[33] *Daily Courant*, Jan. 15, 1725.

14, 1735),[34] where dancers took the parts of the King of Spades, the Queen of Spades, the Knave of Spades, the King of Hearts, the Queen of Diamonds, and the Knave of Clubs.

Very popular too were the ballets, many of which apparently were imported from France or were imitative of popular ones given at Paris. One whose title suggests direct imitation of foreign models was "Les Bergeries. A ballet composed in the taste of Mons. Dumoulin and Mlle. Camargo of the Opera of Paris," in nine parts (Drury Lane, September 23, 1732).[35] Still others were composed by French dancers appearing in London. Mons. Roger, who had been a Harlequin with a visiting French troop before joining the Drury Lane players, presented one of his own compositions, "Le Badinage Champetre," in Drury Lane, November 19, 1725.[36] Similarly, Mons. Desnoyer, another visitor, composed a "New Grand Ballet d'Amour" from the Venus and Adonis story, a plot frequently used by English musicians and dancers for their own compositions; it had ten parts, those of Adonis, Venus, and four attendants on each (Drury Lane, February 21, 1732).[37]

The popularity and numbers of the French performers led, somewhat naturally, to antagonism between them and the English actors and critics, and occasionally, at least, developed an arrogant attitude in the visiting performers.[38] Betterton and Weaver criticized the French severely, the former because they lacked variety:

> . . . For first, the best of *French Dancers* are without Variety; their Steps, their Posture, their Risings are perpetually the *same* UNMEANING *Motion* ; a *French Dancer* being at best but a *graceful Mover*, full of a brisk and senseless activity, unworthy the Eye of a Man of Sense, who can take no Pleasure worth attending, in which the Mind has not a considerable Share.[39]

Weaver made somewhat the same criticism, but added also some

[34] *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, Oct. 14, 1735.

[35] *Daily Post*, Sept. 23, 1732.

[36] *Daily Courant*, Nov. 19, 1725.

[37] *Daily Post*, Feb. 21, 1732.

[38] An amusing example of this arrogance is shown in an apology by Mons. de Grimbergue, director of the French comedians, when he explained why his company did not act one evening. For one thing, Signora Violante was ill; for another, "Monsr Dangeville refused to Dance, being puffed up with the Applause he had the good fortune to meet with: fancying he hath a right to do so whenever he pleases." (*Daily Courant*, May 2, 1720.)

[39] Charles Gildon, *Life of Mr. Betterton* (London, 1710), p. 144.

examples of their false taste. In praising an English dancer, Weaver said that he

> has not given into those gross Errors of the *French* Masters who have been in England, and whose greatest Endowments were in having a confus'd *Chaos* of *Steps*, which they indifferently apply'd, without any Design, to all *Characters*; they car'd not by what ridiculous, awkward, out of the way *Action*, they gain'd Applause; and judg'd of their Mean *Performances*, by the mistaken Taste of the *Audience*. I remember one of these celebrated *French* Masters, compos'd an *Entry* for four *Furies*, and the next Week the very same *Dance* was perform'd to represent the four *Winds*, with this only Alteration, that the *Master* himself by Dancing in the middle made a *fifth*; the same Mistake I have also seen in the four *Seasons*; I must confess they dress'd well, but consulted Finery before what was natural; insomuch that I have seen *Sailors*, *Clowns*, *Chimney-sweepers*, *Witches*, and such like, perform'd in *Shoes lac'd*, and *Ribbanded*, *Red-Silk Stockings*, and sometimes *Cravat-strings*; but enough of this . . .[40]

On the other hand, the English frequently praised their own performers highly, for apparently their judgment was formed by patriotic sentiment as well as theoretical principles. For instance, *The Spectator* for May 5, 1712, gave its praise not only to stage dancing in general but also to one of the English dancers, Mrs. Bicknell, in particular:

> As it is certain that a Stage ought to be wholly suppressed, or judiciously encouraged, while there is one in the Nation, Men turned for regular Pleasure cannot employ their Thoughts more usefully for the Diversion of Mankind, than by convincing them that it is in themselves to raise this Entertainment to the greatest Height. It would be a great Improvement, as well as Embellishment to the Theatre, if Dancing were more regarded, and taught to all the Actors. One who has the Advantage of such an agreeable girlish Person as Mrs. *Bicknell*, joyned with her Capacity of Imitation, could in proper Gesture and Motion represent all the decent Characters of Female Life. . . . Such elegant Entertainments as these, would polish the Town into Judgment in their Gratifications; and Delicacy in Pleasure is the first Step People of Condition take in Reformation from Vice. Mrs. *Bicknell* has the only Capacity for this sort of Dancing of any on the Stage; and I dare say all who see her Performance to Morrow Night, when sure the Romp will do her best for her own Benefit, will be of my Mind.

Later in the century the author of a letter to the *Daily Post* similarly expressed a great admiration for the dancing of the two Robinson sisters, whose benefit was forthcoming:

[40] Weaver, *History of Dancing*, p. 167.

The eldest has that becoming Softness and Ease in her Performance, mix'd with an agreeable Affection wonderfully pleasing and genteel: The youngest shines in a different Light; her sprightly Disposition has a Vivacity and Strength that marks the Steps in Cadence with a Firmness which strikes the Hearts of the Spectators, and gives them Pleasure and Surprise.[41]

The French did not, however, always lack the approval of the English, nor did they fail to influence English dancing. One of the foremost French dancers who appeared in London was Mlle. Marie Sallé, concerning whom there has survived a detailed account which stresses both the nature of one of her dances and the becoming realism of her costume. The account was written by the London correspondent of the *Mercure de France,* March 16, 1734; it described a ballet entitled "Pygmalion":

The subject is developed in the following manner. Pygmalion comes into his studio with his pupils, who perform a characteristic dance, chisel and mallet in hand. Pygmalion tells them to draw aside a curtain at the back of the studio, which is adorned with statues. The one in the middle attracts the special attention of everyone. Pygmalion gazes at it and sighs, and by every token he is passionately in love with it. He then throws himself at the feet of the statue of Venus, and prays to the goddess to animate his beloved figure. She answers his prayers, and the marble beauty emerges by degrees from her state of insensibility. She evinces her astonishment at her new existence, and the delighted Pygmalion extends his hand to her; she feels, so to speak, the ground with her feet, and takes some timid steps. Pygmalion dances before her as if to instruct her. She repeats her master's steps from the easiest to the most difficult. You can understand what all the passages of this action become executed and danced with the fine and delicate grace of Mdlle. Sallé. She ventures to appear without basket, without a dress, in her natural hair, and with no ornament on her head. She wore nothing in addition to her boddice and under petticoat but a simple robe of muslin, arranged in drapery after the model of a Greek statue. You cannot doubt, sir of the success this ingenious ballet, so well executed, obtained.[42]

Although dances and ballets such as these continued to be given throughout the whole period, they were not as numerous or apparently as popular as dances involving characters of the *commedia dell'arte,* which first appeared in individual and small group dances and finally in pantomimes of varying complexity. In preceding

[41] *Daily Post,* May 14, 1728.

[42] H. S. Wyndham, *Annals of Covent Garden* (London, 1906), I, 43-4. Mlle. Sallé seems at other times also to have introduced more realism into the costuming of the dances; see Dutton Cook, *A Book of the Play* (London, 1876), II, 247-8.

decades, when these characters had been introduced into plays and miscellaneous dances, the English had become acquainted with them; in the first half of the eighteenth century the London theaters developed a greater variety of *commedia dell'arte* dances and introduced the pantomime proper into popular favor. These short dances and the pantomimes were not entirely unrelated by any means, for, first of all, even the simplest of the dances served to acquaint the audiences with a great variety of *commedia dell'arte* characters and actions. Such were some of the brief dances performed during 1703 and 1704. In Drury Lane, on February 12, 1703, for instance, there was "A Dance between a Scaramouch Man and a Scaramouch Woman, by Mr. Laferry and Mrs. Lucas, being entirely new and never perform'd before."[43] Individual Scaramouches also appeared frequently in dances, some of which may have been similar to those which Lambranzi described, such as the following:

When the curtain rises this ridiculous person is seen at the back of the stage. Gradually coming to the front, he regains his true height. Then he throws the cloak behind him, jumps upwards, keeping his knees straight and stretching his legs as far apart as possible, and comes to the ground with his knees straight. After this he performs quite easily the long *pas de scaramouche* with *cabrioles* in a different manner until the air ends.[44]

A more complex performance involving both Harlequin and Scaramouch was given in detail by Lambranzi:

Scaramouch enters muffled up in a cloak and bearing a musket in his hand. He puts a lighted candle at the end of the barrel and waits until Harlequin has finished dancing. After he has shot him dead he retreats into the 'wings,' but Harlequin gets up and runs off to the opposite side. Now Scaramouch enters carrying a lantern to look at the dead body, but unable to find it, he turns away again. Harlequin quickly lies down midway across the stage. Scaramouch returns again without a lantern and falls headlong over Harlequin. He rises, takes hold of him, stands him stiffly on his feet and turns his head to and fro, sometimes forwards, sometimes backwards. Then he throws him over his leg and again stands him on his feet, picks him up on his back and carries him off; and with this the air comes to an end.[45]

There were dances too by other characters of this group. Cherrier,

[43] *Daily Courant*, Feb. 12, 1703.

[44] Lambranzi, *op. cit.*, Part I, Dance No. 23, p. 23. The *pas de scaramouche*, a footnote adds, "appears to be a long stride, so exaggerated that the body is almost touching the ground."

[45] *Ibid.*, Part I, Dance No. 30, p. 24.

for instance, danced a "Punchanello" in Drury Lane, June 29, 1704;[46] Mezzetin too had been presented on the stage in "a New Entertainment of Dancing between *Mezetin,* Clown, and two Charmen" (Lincoln's Inn Fields, June 8, 1703).[47]

It can readily be seen that with short and occasionally rather complex dances being frequently performed, it was not difficult to incorporate some of them into a longer and connected dance or "scene," as the more complex ones came to be called. In fact, Momus, writing in the *London Journal* for April 3, 1725, suggested that the development of the pantomime was prepared for gradually by the shorter performances:

> At length, to crown all, those delightful Entertainments, called *Dumb Shows*, were brought amongst us; but not at once, nor in the Manner in which They now appear; for it required much Time and great Application to bring them to that Perfection. At first, they insinuated themselves into our Favour in short *Interludes*, and antick *Dances, between Acts;* which lasted for some Years, and meeting with uncommon Applause, this encouraged a new Sett of Wits to rise up and give the last Stroke to the old fashioned Writings of the *Stage*, by forming *long Farces* upon this *grotesque* Model. Nay, we have been threatened with whole *Comedies* in the same Way.

In this process of building the pantomime it was again John Weaver who appeared as an important figure. In his *History of the Mimes and Pantomimes* Weaver credited himself with devising the first English pantomime of the type which became popular with London audiences:

> The first Entertainment that appeared on the *English* Stage, where the Representation and Story was carried on by Dancing, Action, and Motion only, was performed in Grotesque Characters, after the manner of the Modern *Italians*, such as *Harlequin, Scaramouch*, & and was called The Tavern Bilkers. Composed by Mr. *Weaver*, and first performed in *Drury-Lane* Theatre 1702.[48]

---

[46] *Daily Courant*, June 29, 1704.

[47] *Ibid.*, June 8, 1703.

[48] John Weaver, *The History of the Mimes and Pantomimes, with an Historical Account of several Performers in Dancing, living at the Time of the Roman Emperors. To which will be added, A List of the Modern Entertainments that have been exhibited on the English Stage, either in Imitation of the ancient Pantomimes, or after the Manner of the Modern Italians; when and where first Performed, and by whom Composed* (London, 1728), p. 45.

Weaver's claim has not always been accepted, and Professor Nicoll [49] and others have pointed out the conflict between Weaver and John Rich as to which one really deserves the credit. On the whole, more attention has been given to Rich, probably because his greater fame as a deviser and performer of pantomimes, especially in the years after 1720, has brought him credit for their innovation as well. To some extent Weaver's claim can be substantiated, even though a definite record of his first pantomime has not been located. There is no doubt, first of all, that he was decidedly interested and actively engaged in dancing in the early decades of the century, long before Rich was active; Weaver's books, as well as his own performances on the stage, testify to that. Furthermore, among the theatrical advertisements of 1702 and 1703 there are "entertainments" which may possibly have been Weaver's *Tavern Bilkers* or imitations of it. The nearest to it was one given in Drury Lane, October 12, 1703, "a Comical Entertainment in a Tavern between Scaramouch, Harlequin, and Punchanello." [50] In 1702 also there had been some "night scenes" which may have had some relation to Weaver's but they were advertised in such general terms that their exact nature cannot be determined: "Night Scene by a Harlequin and a Scaramouch after the Italian Manner" (Drury Lane, August 22, 1702,[51] and repeated on October 20, 1702),[52] and (possibly the same one) "a Night Scene by a Harlequin and a Scaramouch, to be perform'd by the Famous Monsieur Surrein and Mr. Baxter, who make but a short stay in England (Drury Lane, October 7, 1703).[53]

Although Weaver's priority cannot be definitely determined here,[54] he had a considerable influence on the pantomimes which

[49] *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 252.

[50] *Daily Courant*, Oct. 12, 1703.

[51] *Ibid.*, Aug. 22, 1702.

[52] *Ibid.*, Oct. 20, 1702.

[53] *Ibid.*, Oct. 7, 1703. At Bartholomew Fair during 1700 there was presented an entertainment of dancing which seems similar to Weaver's: "a New Entertainment between a Scaramouch, a Harlequin, and a Punchinello, in imitation of Bilking a Reckoning." See Henry Morley, *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair* (London, 1859), p. 350.

[54] Wyndham, *Annals of Covent Garden*, I, 10-11, 14, in discussing where Rich got his suggestions for his pantomimes, noted W. J. Lawrence's point that Rich need not have gone to France for them, as Weaver had earlier presented pantomimes similar to Rich's later ones.

finally became established, and in his books he treated in detail, not only the history of pantomime in Greece, Rome, and England, but also the theory of pantomimic performances, the practice, and the qualifications necessary for good pantomimes and for a good dancer in them. In both his histories Weaver admitted that modern dancing had fallen short of the perfection of Greek and Roman dancing,[55] but insisted that the modern dances had come nearer to the earliest dances of the Greeks and Romans than to the less perfect mimic art of the days when the Romans

> had sunk into Effeminacy, and lost all the manly Taste of the great Arts as well as Arms; the Stage . . . sunk into Ridiculous Representations.[56]

It was in his publication of 1712 that Weaver most thoroughly developed the qualities of pantomime,[57] emphasizing especially the non-speaking character of the ancient (and, as he felt, the ideal) pantomime, in contrast to the modern French and Italian speaking pantomimes:

> *The Pantomimes*, as I said before, were *Imitations of all Things*, as the Name Imports, and perform'd all by *Gesture*, and the *Action* of Hands, Legs, and Feet, without making Use of the *Tongue* in uttering their Thoughts; and in this Performance the Hands and Fingers were much made Use of; and express'd perhaps a *large Share* of the Performance. *Aristotle* says, that they imitated by *Number* alone, without *Harmony*, for they imitated the Manners, Passions, and Actions, by the *numerous Variety of Gesticulation*.[58]

It was in the representation of the manners and passions of mankind that the pantomime had its value, Weaver felt, and it was a lack of this quality in the French dancers that had made them fall short of the perfection of the ancient mimics, for the French had nothing "more than Motion, Figure, and Measure."[59] Even Ballon,

> (the best we have seen on our stage) . . . pretended to nothing more than a *graceful Motion*, with *strong* and *nimble Risings*, and the casting his Body into several (perhaps) agreeable Postures: But for expressing any thing in *Nature* but *modulated Motion*, it was never in his Head: The

---

[55] *History of Dancing*, pp. 8-9; *History of Mimes and Pantomimes*, p. 2.

[56] *History of Dancing*, p. 118.

[57] Much of his discussion he repeated almost word for word in the *History of Mimes and Pantomimes* (1728).

[58] *History of Dancing*, pp. 121-2.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Imitation of the Manners and Passions of Mankind he never knew anything of, nor ever therefore pretended to shew us.[60]

In order to reach his great perfection, the ancient mimic, Weaver declared, must have known "all the Fables of the old Poets," for he was to describe in motion what they had given in words; therefore he had to know "*Philosophy, . . . Moral* and *Natural, Rhetorick, Painting, Sculpture,* and the like."[61] Physically, he should have been not "too tall, nor too low, but of a moderate Size; not too fat and bulky, not too lean like a Skeleton."[62] Summing up all of these qualifications, Weaver stated that the modern mime should

. . . be of an active, pliant, and yet a compacted Body; able to turn with Quickness, and to stop if Occasion require with Strength. In a Word, a *Pantomime,* to deserve that Name, must be every Thing exactly, and do all Things with Order, Decency, and Measure like himself, without any Imperfection, have his Thoughts perfectly compos'd, yet excel in a Vivacity of Mind, a quick Apprehension, and deep Judgment; and his Applause must be the necessary Consequence of his Performance, in which every Spectator must behold himself acted, and see in the *Dancer,* as in a Glass, all that he himself us'd to do and suffer.[63]

Finally, after much quoting of ancient and modern writers concerning pantomime and after discussing the serious, grotesque, and scenical types of dancing, Weaver expressed a wish that the English would improve themselves in that art.[64]

There is no doubt that the English encouraged pantomime, although its growth was for a few years rather slow. For a decade after the publication of Weaver's *History of Dancing,* numerous short "night scenes" continued to be presented, some of which were more complex than the earliest ones. In 1716, for instance, Surrein and Baxter, who had performed in 1702 and 1703, were back in Drury Lane, where on April 4 they presented an act whose title suggests that it had a slight plot to it: "The Whimsical Death of Harlequin."[65] Other dances in the same year frequently involved more characters; one in Drury Lane, October 18, was

[60] *Ibid.*
[61] *History of Dancing,* p. 139.
[62] *Ibid.,* p. 144.
[63] *Ibid.,* pp. 145-6. In 1728 Weaver again used this material almost word for word.
[64] *Ibid.,* p. 169.
[65] *Daily Courant,* April 4, 1716.

"A Comic Dance of Dame Ragondy and her Family in the Characters of a Harlequin Man and Woman; a Scaramouch Man and Woman; Two Fools; a Punch; and Dame Ragondy." [66] How much story there was to it is not clear. It was also during this season of 1716-1717 that there appeared a number of those longer entertainments of the type later called pantomimes; they began in considerable rivalry between Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields. Drury Lane, according to Weaver,[67] presented during this season his *Loves of Mars and Venus,* which he described as "an Attempt in Imitation of the ancient Pantomimes, and the first of that kind that has appeared since the Time of the Roman Emperors." According to the theatrical advertisements, this pantomime was first presented on March 2, 1717, when it was labelled "new." [68] Late in 1716, however, it had been preceded in Lincoln's Inn Fields by a "New Italian Mimick Scene, Scaramouch, Harlequin, Country Farmer, his Wife, and others" (December 26),[69] a "scene" which on December 29 was called *Harlequin Executed; or, The Farmer Disappointed.*[70] Weaver ascribed this piece to Rich ("Mr. Lun") as of 1717,[71] although it was performed late in 1716. Once again there is a question of priority; it is possible that, although Rich's piece appeared first, Weaver did not consider that it was a true pantomime or in "Imitation of the ancient *Pantomimes.*"

No matter who was really first in the production of pantomimes proper, competition between Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields was beginning in earnest. To some extent it was such competition between the theaters that, in Colley Cibber's opinion, brought about the introduction of such novelties and caused the houses to continue embellishing each novelty as it developed. Cibber believed that at this particular time the popularity of Italian music forced the theaters to present something new; that something was the pantomime, and from *The Loves of Mars and Venus,* which Cibber, partial to Drury Lane, considered the original of that type, grew a steady stream of competitive pantomimes.[72]

[66] *Ibid.*, Oct. 18, 1716.
[67] *History of Mimes and Pantomimes,* p. 46.
[68] *Daily Courant,* March 2, 1717.
[69] *Ibid.*, Dec. 26, 1716.
[70] *Ibid.*, Dec. 29, 1716.
[71] *History of Mimes and Pantomimes,* p. 47.
[72] Colley Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber,* ed. R. W. Lowe (London, 1889), I, 179-181.

*The Loves of Mars and Venus,* which appeared in Drury Lane on March 2, 1717, was the first of that house's two spring pantomimes. It represented in dancing alone, without singing or dialogue, this mythological story which had earlier been used for musical masques. It had a number of characters: Mars, Vulcan, Venus, Three Graces, and Four Followers of Mars. Since it had no characters of the *commedia dell'arte,* it corresponded to what later was called the "serious" part of the pantomime. Drury Lane's second one, however, was a combination of a mythological story with a *commedia dell'arte* narrative. It was given on April 2, 1717,[73] with the title, "a New Dramatick Entertainment of Dancing in Grotesque Characters, call'd, The Shipwreck; or, Perseus and Andromeda." Its mythological characters were paralleled by "grotesque" ones: Perseus was represented by Harlequin, Andromeda by Columbine, the Monster by the Crocodile, with Four Sailors and their Wives.[74]

In the same month Lincoln's Inn Fields presented two new pantomimes. The first, given on April 22,[75] was an "Italian Night Scene called The Cheats; or, The Tavern Bilkers," wherein John Rich, as 'Lun,' acted Harlequin, a part which he was to make one of the major attractions of his theater. This was succeeded, on April 29,[76] by a "New Dramatick Entertainment of Dancing in Grotesque Characters, call'd, The Jealous Doctor; or, The Intriguing Dame." Here again the parts were double: Dame Fossile was represented by Punch; Plotwell by Scaramouch; Underplot by Harlequin; Ptisan by Pierot; and Mrs. Townley by Columbine.[77]

In the winter of 1717 the two houses began to imitate each other even more noticeably. Lincoln's Inn Fields led off with a pantomime similar to Drury Lane's *The Loves of Mars and Venus,* except that *commedia dell'arte* parts were added; this piece was a "Dramatick Entertainment of Dancing in Grotesque Characters, call'd Mars and Venus, or the Mouse Trap," with Mars, Vulcan,

[73] *Daily Courant,* April 2, 1717.

[74] For the connection of this piece with *Three Hours After Marriage,* see George Sherburn, "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of *Three Hours after Marriage,*" *Modern Philology,* XXIV (1926), 108.

[75] *Daily Courant,* April 22, 1717.

[76] *Ibid.,* April 29, 1717.

[77] This pantomime was Lincoln's Inn Fields' contribution to the controversy over *Three Hours after Marriage.*

Venus, three Graces, The Hour, four Scaramouches as followers of Mars, the Cyclops, the Foreman of the Shop, and four Carpenters as the characters. The imitation was hardly successful, for it appeared only four times in 1717 after the initial performance on November 22,[78] and died out until it was revived in 1725. The other two pantomimes of this season were also similar to each other. In Drury Lane Weaver presented on December 5,[79] a "New Dramatick Entertainment of Dancing call'd Harlequin turn'd Judge," for which the names of the parts or players were not given. Lincoln's Inn Fields countered promptly, on December 11,[80] with a "New Italian Night Scene, Columbine; or Harlequin turned Judge," with Harlequin acted by Rich, Scaramouch by Thurmond, Mezzetin by Boval, and Columbine by Mrs. Schoolding. Neither pantomime apparently was particularly successful.

New pantomimes appeared less frequently in 1718. One of the more important ones, which was by Rich, was of what Weaver called a "mixt" character; it was a "New Dramatick Opera in Serious and Grotesque Characters, call'd, Amadis, or the Loves of Harlequin and Columbine" (Lincoln's Inn Fields, January 24, 1718.[81] This pantomime differed from Weaver's type in two respects: it was a mixture of the serious and grotesque, and the serious parts contained dialogue and singing, while the grotesque parts only were silent. On March 6, 1718,[82] Weaver produced in Drury Lane another of his wholly silent pantomimes, which was again labelled as being "after the Manner of the Ancient Pantomimes" and was called *The Fable of Orpheus and Eurydice.* For a while after this the theaters produced few new pantomimes, contenting themselves with revivals of old ones.

In fact, it was not until late in 1723 that the pantomimes again appeared as such an important part of the theaters' programs. By that time Weaver was no longer the chief composer of pantomimes for Drury Lane, although John Rich retained his prominence in Lincoln's Inn Fields. John Thurmond, another dancing master who had taken Weaver's place, produced on November 26, 1723,[83] one of the most famous of all the pantomimes, *Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* which concluded with a "Masque of the Deities." With this entertainment pantomimes began to experience fairly long

[78] *Daily Courant,* Nov. 22, 1717.
[79] *Ibid.,* Dec. 5, 1717.
[80] *Ibid.,* Dec. 11, 1717.
[81] *Ibid.,* Jan. 24, 1718.
[82] *Ibid.,* March 6, 1718.
[83] *Ibid.,* Nov. 26, 1723.

runs, for this one was presented during the rest of November and half of December, and was revived frequently, often with some changes in the plot. Lincoln's Inn Fields responded within a month, on December 20, 1723,[84] with *The Necromancer; or Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* a piece which was played during the rest of December and almost daily through January and February of the next year. By this time pantomimes had become so firmly established that a half dozen new ones were presented each year and the old ones were repeatedly revised and presented again, often with steady runs of a month or more. At a time when *The Beggar's Opera* had not yet begun its exceptionally long run, the pantomimes were setting records of their own and dominating the legitimate play. With occasional and slight variations, their popularity continued for many years.[85]

It has already been suggested that there were several types of English pantomimes, all of which can be grouped into three main classes. There were (1) those which, like Weaver's *The Loves of Mars and Venus,* consisted of a "serious" part containing a mythological or traditional story often presented in dancing alone;

[84] *Ibid.,* Dec. 20, 1723.

[85] Although accounts of English pantomime in the eighteenth century may be found in a number of publications, the study of this dramatic type has usually been undertaken only as a part of the survey of a larger problem or as a chapter in the history of the English theater. Wyndham, for example, in his *Annals of Covent Garden,* treated it briefly (I, 8-18) in connection with John Rich and Covent Garden. Otto Francke in 1886 edited Mountfort's *Life and Death of Dr. Faustus,* a seventeenth century play, but his interest was primarily in the Faustus theme in English drama before Mountfort. A more thorough study was R. J. Broadbent's *A History of Pantomime* (London, 1901), where, after several chapters on early Greek and Roman pantomime, he devoted two chapters, XIV and XV, to pantomime between 1700 and 1740. In 1912 Winifred Smith, in her study, *The Commedia dell'arte* (London, 1912), while emphasizing the origin and characteristics of the *commedia dell'arte,* surveyed briefly, pp. 222-228, some aspects of its development in English theaters from 1660 to 1740. Her attention was given mainly to the pantomimes which were produced by visiting French or Italian performers. Allardyce Nicoll, in his *History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama,* pp. 251-8, analyzed the pantomime in his study of the miscellaneous productions of the period, and printed a valuable list of the pantomimes produced from 1700 to 1750. In his later *Masks, Mimes, and Miracles* (New York, 1931), he presented a study of the theory and history of the *commedia dell'arte,* but little discussion of the eighteenth century pantomime.

(2) those which, like *Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* lacked a "serious" or mythological part and presented only the "grotesque," usually dancing and antics by *commedia dell'arte* characters; and (3) those which, like *Apollo and Daphne, or The Burgo-Master Tricked* or *Harlequin a Sorcerer; or, The Loves of Pluto and Proserpine,* consisted of alternate "scenes" of "serious" material, usually the mythological stories in dancing and often with song and dialogue, and of "grotesque" parts.

Although the first type was considered by Weaver to be the true imitation of the ancient pantomimes, there were fewer examples of this variety than of any other and most of those, like *The Loves of Mars and Venus* and *Orpheus and Eurydice,*[86] were composed by Weaver himself. Both dealt with subjects certainly familiar to the theater-going public; Motteux, for instance, had in 1695 presented and published his *The Love of Mars and Venus. A Play Set to Music,* and John Dennis, in 1707, had published his masque of *Orpheus and Eurydice,* although it probably was never acted.

Weaver's method was to take a familiar story and to present it without music or dialogue, relying upon dancing alone to convey the story to the audience. The general nature of this type is suggested in Cibber's comments upon *The Loves of Mars and Venus,* in which the fable was formed

> into a connected Presentation of Dances in Character, wherein the Passions were so happily expressed, and the whole Story so intelligibly told by a mute Narration of Gesture only, that even thinking Spectators allow'd it both a pleasing and rational Entertainment; though, at the same time, from our Distrust of its Reception, we durst not venture to decorate it with any extraordinary Expence of Scenes or Habits; but upon the Success of this Attempt it was rightly concluded, that if a visible Expence in both were added to something of the same Nature, it could not fail of drawing the Town proportionably after it.[87]

---

[86] Only the second of these apparently was printed, and that in a rather unusual form for a dramatic piece. Weaver in 1718 published it with the title, *The Fable of Orpheus and Eurydice, with a Dramatic Entertainment in Dancing thereupon Attempted in Imitation of the Ancient Greeks and Romans.* This version is simply the fable told in alternate prose and verse, with no indication of the play. Of course, since there was no singing or dialogue in this type of pantomime, there obviously would not be much to publish except the stage directions concerning what each character was to do.

[87] *Apology,* ed. Lowe, I, 180.

In 1724 when the same pantomime was revived, it brought forth some comment in one of the periodicals. Although the discussion did not present very clearly just what the piece was like, it did indicate the reaction of a spectator presumably not prejudiced for or against the theater:

> After the Play, was presented the Lucubration of an eminent Dancing-Master, entitled, *The Loves of Mars and Venus*. The thing was not amiss in its kind, and in another Place had not been disagreeable; the Misfortune is, that this volatile Species, the Enditers of this sort of Wit, have less reading, if possible, than even the modern Authors. The *Cyclops* of Antiquity had the Misfortune to be one-ey'd, but these Moderns vastly surpass'd them in that Respect, and star'd the Audience out of Countenance with two apiece. . . .
>
> I observ'd nothing else remarkable in the Dance but that *Vulcan* gave to each of his Workmen certain Qualities of Wit, which having been manufactured by them some Time in the Furnace, and upon the Anvil, most miraculously produc'd a Pack-thread Net, in which *Mars* and *Venus* were unhappily ensnar'd, and expos'd to the Ridicule of the Heathen Divinities. . . .
>
> The Gods were all as ragged as Colts, and stunk of Filth like so many Night-men; but this is the better to be excused, because of late Years 'tis well known the Dividends of the Stage have been so very small, as not to admit of dressing any of the Actors in clean Cloaths, but the Masters themselves.[88]

Generally, this type of pantomime failed to gain a great deal of approval. Although it handled a traditional and well-known story according to a method somewhat new, it lacked many other qualities which were likely to bring it applause. Apparently it had no humorous elements whatsoever and gave no opportunity for the exceedingly marvelous or for whatever enjoyment was to come from the performances of Harlequin and his followers.

Much more popular were those pantomimes which presented a "dumb" farce in which the *commedia dell'arte* characters were the main attraction. To this class belong two of the earlier rival pantomimes, *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* of Drury Lane and *The Necromancer, or Harlequin Doctor Faustus* of Lincoln's Inn Fields. As in the previous type, the story here was not new and had been handled in a somewhat similar fashion in Mountfort's *Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* of 1686. The most pronounced difference between Mountfort's farce and the eighteenth century Faustus pantomimes is the lack of dialogue in the latter.

[88] *Pasquin*, Feb. 18, 1724.

*Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* the production of John Thurmond, was printed in 1724. It presents Faustus as a combination of the legendary Faustus and of Harlequin, for he is a conjurer and magician, a trickster and a dancer, with Pierot, Punch, and Scaramouch as aids in his activities. The play relies to a considerable extent upon spectacular events and scenes, as well as upon trickery and humor. It begins with Faustus' calling upon Mephostophilus, who appropriately appears in thunder and lightning, "upon a Dragon, vomiting Fire." After receiving his wand, Faustus tells fortunes to two countrymen and their wives, after which he seizes the women. When the husbands object, Faustus again utilizes his magic:

The Doctor waves his Wand, it thunders, several Devils enter, and fright the Husbands, who run into the Porch of the House for Shelter; which on the Instant turns with 'em in, and in their room, a Table furnish'd with a Collation comes out. Mephostophilus sets him down to make one at the Table, whose frightful Appearance drives the Women away: Faustus waves his Wand, and the Spirit is chang'd into a well-dress'd Shepherd, who dances to entertain 'em, then bows to the Company, and sinks.[89]

The scene outlined by this summary illustrates the episodic nature of the events and the use of rapid changes of scene, the frequent entrances and "sinkings," and the transformations typical of this type of pantomime. The scene continues to introduce Scaramouch, Punch, and Pierot, who are admitted to Faustus' home, and after some dancing, are entertained:

. . . while they are drinking, the Doctor waves his Wand, the Table rises, and forms a rich Canopy, under which the Spirit of *Helen* . . . sits; she rises, Dances an Entry, retires to the Canopy, and Sinks. The Students seem surpriz'd, they perform a Dance, and go out.

Sometime later the Doctor gives a more startling performance; he negotiates with a usurer for a loan, but the money-lender wants Faustus' right leg as security:

The Doctor offers him his Arm, or his Head; but still he insists on his Right Leg. At last he complies, puts it on the Table, the Usurer cuts it off with a Knife brought for that purpose, and goes out with the Leg,

[89] This quotation and those following are from the 1724 edition of *Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* a publication which is mainly a summary of the actions the performers are expected to present.

rejoicing and mocking the Doctor.—The Doctor waves his Wand, on which enters *Mephostophilus,* who knowing what he wants, waves his Wand, and immediately Legs of several colours, sorts, and sizes, both Mens and Womens, file in; the Doctor chuses one, which is a Woman's, and it immediately runs from the rest, and fixes to the Doctor's Leg: He jumps on the Table, and admirs his Leg, then jumps on the Ground, and dances to a brisk Tune.

Some of the adventures are rustic in setting; in these Harlequin is more of a trickster and less the traditional Faustus, for he plagues the countrymen with varieties of actions. Harlequin turns himself into a monkey, then into a countryman, and finally flies out through the ceiling of the cottage. Later he and his comrades come to a barn and a thatched house, where after a series of tricks, they set fire to the barn and leave, laughing at the simple-minded countrymen. After these episodes the time comes for Faustus to give himself up to the devils:

. . . two Fiends enter and seize the Doctor, and are sinking with him headlong thro' Flames, other Devils run in, and tear him piece meal, some fly away with the limbs, and others sink. Time and Death go out.

At the conclusion of the farce is a "Masque of the Deities," who are rejoicing in Heaven at the Enchanter's death, for he was supposed to have power over the sun, the moon, and the seasons; the pantomime concludes with dancing by Mars, Bacchus and Ceres, Mercury and Diana. Although Thurmond had apparently banished song and dialogue from the pantomime proper, he had also sought to give the audience a small taste of them by adding the masque at the end.

*The Necromancer, or Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* which apparently was not published in full,[90] differed in some details from *Harlequin Doctor Faustus,* especially in allowing occasional dia-

[90] A portion of one of the revised versions was printed in *The Weekly Amusement,* July 19, 1735, at a time when the farce was again popular. Some notion of the attraction this pantomine had may be gathered from the frequency of performance and revision for revivals, as well as from newspaper "puffs" like the following from the *Daily Journal,* Jan. 9, 1724: "On Tuesday, when the new Dramatic Entertainment of Dancing in Grotesque Characters, called, *The Necromancer, or Harlequin Dr. Faustus* was perform'd at Lincoln's-Inn-Fields' Play-House: The Concourse of People to see it was so exceeding great, that many Hundreds were obliged to go back again, as not being able to gain admittance; the Entertainment was wonderful satisfactory to the Audience, as exceeding all the Legerdemain that has hitherto been performed on the Stages."

logue and song to be used by some of the infernal spirits, such as Helen, Charon, etc. Harlequin as Faustus remained silent. Nevertheless the grotesque portions of the two pieces must have been somewhat similar, for both were based on the same general plot. The general similarity of the two farces is indicated in an article in the *Universal Journal* for March 4, 1724; the author on his return to town made a visit to the two houses and gave his opinion of what he saw:

> I would not have you think I am condemning Mr. *Lunn's Necromancer*, in complaisance to my *quondam* Friends of *Drury-Lane*. I think Dr. *Faustus* makes an equal ridiculous Figure at both Houses. *Lunn* has improved upon them; they are improving upon him again. You will see strange alterations, Cloaks flying upon Men's Shoulders, *Harlequin*, *Scaramouch*, *Punch*, and *Pierrot* riding upon Spirits in the Air; dancing Wheat-Sheaves, Flaming Barns, Barking Dogs, flying Flasks and Oranges, and Fellows, to escape a Scouring, venture their Neck down a Chimney; Things altogether as edifying and entertaining as to see a Couple of Fellows spend half an Hour in kicking and buffeting each other by way of Preparation to their coursing each other half an Hour round a Windmill.[91]

The success of these diverting pieces in the season of 1723-1724 apparently inspired the performers to spend a portion of the spring and summer preparing greater accomplishments for the next season. The *Universal Journal* indicated the preparations being made by the two houses:

> In Expectation of this Happy Time, they are to spend the whole Summer in making necessary Preparations, inventing new Engines, and new Machines. We are to have a Scene of Old Women who are by far to outfly the Lancashire Witches; and singing Spirits, superior to those in the Tempest. Others are contriving strange Metamorphoses, and are to give us the Masque of the Amours of Jupiter and Leda, and of the Loves of Venus and Adonis. In the Former, Harlequin in the Character of Jupiter, is to be chang'd into a Swan upon the Stage; and in the latter, he is to be devoured in the Presence of the Audience by a Wild Boar, and then turned into a Flower.[92]

The number of pantomimes which presented the story of Faustus' life was necessarily somewhat limited, and the two houses usually revised and revived the original ones. In an effort to vary

[91] More of the rivalry between the two houses was reflected in a satiric discussion of the competition between the giant of Lincoln's Inn Fields and the dragon of Drury Lane; see *Pasquin*, Jan. 28, 1724.

[92] *Universal Journal*, March 25, 1724.

the pantomimes, the composers therefore sought other similar legendary material or had Faustus bequeath his powers to someone else. Thurmond used the latter device in two of his pieces, *The Miser; or, Wagner and Abericock* (1727) and *Harlequin's Triumph* (1727). The "argument" of the former states that Faustus, in his will, made his servant Wagner his sole heir and left to him the spirit Abericock by whose aid Wagner (as Harlequin) "*Produces the following Magical Incidents.*" The plot, which is not particularly original, is the story of Wagner's efforts to win the miser's daughter and money, an enterprise in which he succeeds with the aid of Abericock. Just how the emotions and manners of the characters were to be presented is indicated in the summary of the third scene:

> The Scene changes to the Miser's Chamber. The Miser is discover'd gazing with Joy on heaps of Gold, etc. plac'd on a Table before him. His Action expressed Wealth to be the Treasure of his Soul, the Delight of his Eyes, Musick to his Ears, and that it gives Beauty to his Form, and makes him great, etc. Pierot at the same time is discover'd, roasting an Egg; and he expresses his violent Hunger and hopes of Food.

The kinds of magical effects used are shown in the next scene:

> The Scene changes, and discover's Harlequin's Apartment, the Clown blowing the Fire; Harlequin enters, leading in the Miser's Daughter. He courts and entreats her to sit down, gives orders to the Servant, who draws Abericock out of the Portmantua, who with his Wand strikes a Table, and a Collation immediately appears thereon. Then the Spirit conjures, and four Quakers appear and join in a Dance, at the beginning of which the Women appear coy, etc. A Cupid descends, and hangs over their Heads; they are all inspir'd with Love, and Harlequin and the Daughter join their Dance to a sprightly Tune, at the end of which the four Quakers, who are Spirits, sink, and Cupid ascends.

In an effort to secure much the same effect with some person other than Faustus, one writer turned to Merlin and presented him in a pantomine called *Merlin; or, The Devil of Stonehenge,* to which Lewis Theobald contributed the dialogue parts. The preface indicates that writers saw the need for magicians in pantomimes in order to make probable and logical the miraculous events which were presented:

> . . . As Custom, in *Pantomimes*, has made it a sort of Necessity, in order to give *Tricks* some Air of Probability, that *Harlequin* should be a Piece of a Magician; the Inventor of this Entertainment seems to have judg'd

right, in calling a Place into his Scenary, which Tradition and Superstition wou'd persuade us, ow'd the Original to Magick.[93]

Merlin is here alternately himself and Harlequin, and is early upbraided by the Ghost of Faustus for using those arts which brought downfall to Faustus. As in the Faustus pantomimes, Merlin here performs tricks, appears in some comic scenes, and is taken to hell when his time on earth is over.

The desirability of having a magician in the pantomime seems to have been emphasized by the failure of one of Thurmond's pantomimes, *Harlequin Sheppard* (Drury Lane, 1724). The author attempted to present Jack Sheppard, the notorious criminal, as a Harlequin and to make his exploits as entertaining as those of Faustus. His failure is recorded in one of the periodicals:

The same Night, at the Theatre in Drury Lane, was a new Entertainment call'd *Harlequin Shepherd*, which was dismiss'd with a universal Hiss—and, indeed, if Shepherd had been as wretched, and as silly a Rogue in the World, as the ingenious and witty Managers have made him upon the Stage, the lower Gentry, who attended him to Tyburn, wou'd never have pittied him when he was hang'd.[94]

This pantomime, with which is published a biography of Sheppard, introduces him first in prison, from which he escapes by means of some implements brought to him in a pie. As he is escaping, Thurmond takes the opportunity to insert a scene showing Blueskin cutting Jonathan Wild's throat. Then comes a series of scenes detailing Sheppard's exploits outside the prison. He robs a pawnbroker's shop, a house, where he is discovered but escapes, a meat market, and finally enters an ale-house, where he meets Frisky Moll and is captured by a constable brought by an ale-house boy. The pantomime included songs and dances, but apparently proved dull to an audience which flocked to see the more spectacular Faustus scenes.[95]

The Faustus type of entertainment was not wholly acceptable to some critics who were interested in improving the pantomimes; this type was objected to as not being sufficiently unified in nature

[93] Preface to *The Vocal Parts of an Entertainment call'd, Merlin; or, The Devil of Stone-Henge* (London, 1734).

[94] *Weekly Journal, or Saturday's Post*, Dec. 5, 1724.

[95] For the relation of this pantomime to *The Beggar's Opera*, see W. E. Schultz, *Gay's Beggar's Opera* (New Haven, 1923), p. 169.

and as relying too much upon transformations and shifts of scenery which were lacking in point. One critic analyzed *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* from this point of view:

> The Reader already may perceive that I have my Eye upon *Harlequin Doctor Faustus*, where there is some Transformation in Scenery, but we cannot tell to what End; for we see no Intrigue carrying on, nor no Plot design'd; but those Things are shewn only for the sake of shewing them; therefore I advise the Managers, whenever they give one of these unmeaning Entertainments again, that one of them should stand upon the Stage, and before they begin, tell the Audience, *Gentlemen and Ladies, the next Trick, we shall present you with*, & as is practic'd by Mr. *Fawks*, and other ingenious Persons, who shew Tricks and nothing else.
>
> Perhaps they will answer, that these Things are not to be criticis'd upon the Rules of the Drama, in which I shall agree with them. I have already hinted, that the Stage, while it is shewing one of these Entertainments, is a Piece of inchanted Ground, where every Thing is to appear as surprising as if it was done by the Power of Magick: But all these amazing Changes and Turns must produce some Remarkable Event, Incident, either towards carrying on or unraveling the Plot and Design of the Piece, otherwise the Tricks of a Legerdemain Man are full more diverting.
>
> There are some Persons who have no Heads for producing an ingenious Design, and when such happen to be in the Management of publick Diversions, it should be their Business to consult others of better Taste: There is something in the Legend of Dr. *Faustus* too mean for the Stage. The Theatre should not descend to borrow its Entertainment from the Puppet Shew. The Fictions of the Poets, which we read with so much Pleasure, would furnish Variety of elegant Subjects for those Sorts of Entertainments, such as *Pan* and *Syrinx*, *Apollo* and *Daphne*, or the *Fall of Phaeton*, where there might be a just Pretence for Decoration; the Palace of the Sun might be shewn in all its Splendours, according to the beautiful Description of *Ovid*, on which there might be Work for the Imagination of an ingenious Painter; all the Wonders of Scenery might be expos'd to View as Ornaments properly belonging to the Story. It might be intermix'd with some low Episode or Underplot, in which there would be Room for those pleasant *Harlequinades*, or that Sort of Play which the *Italians* call *Lazzi*, that is, a kind of burlesque Mimickry in the Way of Dance. A Thing thus manag'd, would be an agreeable Addition to a good Play, and divert People of the best Sense.[96]

Whoever this critic was, his constructive criticism was a good forecast of the third type of pantomime. This kind was a combination of a mythological story with a Harlequin episode, frequently developed in alternate scenes. Ordinarily the "serious"

[96] *Weekly Journal, or Saturday's Post*, Dec. 7, 1723.

part of these pantomimes differed from that of Weaver's (which he patterned after the ancient pantomimes) in that Theobald and Thurmond introduced song and speech,[97] as well as dancing, into theirs, leaving the grotesque part, however, usually without song or dialogue. In this way, the producers were able to cater to almost every taste by presenting songs, dialogue, and dancing. The mythological stories frequently enacted were those of Apollo and Daphne, Perseus and Andromeda, Pluto and Proserpine, Cupid and Psyche, and Cephalus and Procris.

The serious part of the entertainment allowed ample scope for impressive scenery and effective machinery. A spectator who witnessed *Jupiter and Europa* stressed the place of scenery and machinery in that pantomime:

> . . . Here we behold the Power of Machinery when we see a Heathen God in an erect Posture shot from an Eminence of sixty or seventy Foot upon the Stage; and, when he has finished his Part, he takes the same Flight, from below: The Transformation of *Jupiter* into a Bull, is done in sight of the Audience; the Contrivance and Deception is so excellent, that we cannot account for it. . . .[98]

The author continued by berating Drury Lane for not exerting itself to reach the excellencies Lincoln's Inn Fields had attained; later in the article he praised this kind of mixed pantomime and expressed the belief that *Jupiter and Europa* was only a faint suggestion of the wonders which were yet to come. James Ralph too stressed the need for and value of machinery:

> It is morally impossible for any Poet, or Master of a *Play-House*, to be too expensive in the Beauty or Grandeur of their Scenes and Machines; The more just and surprising they appear, the sooner will the Spectator be led insensibly into imagining every thing real, and, of consequence, prove the easier perswaded of the Instruction intended: Besides, they are absolutely necessary in all Parts of a Play, where the Plot requires the Intervention of some supernatural Power, in order to conquer Difficulties,

---

[97] James Ralph, who surveyed all the entertainments of the town, thought the addition of music was a handicap to the pantomime: "Thus, by an ill-judg'd Jumble, and wrong blending of two Arts in one Piece, both the true *Italian* Comedy, and our *Grotesque Dramatical* Dances, have miss'd their Point; they form Alliances which will ruin them, and by joining execrable Poetry and vile Musick to beautiful Scenes of just *Grotesque* Dancing, the Perfection of one is lost in the Stupidity of the other. . . ." (*The Taste of the Town* [London, 1731], p. 102).

[98] *Weekly Journal, or Saturday's Post*, April 6, 1723.

and solve Misteries: For, what is a God, or a Devil, or a Conjurer,—without Moving Clouds, Blazing Chariots, Flying Dragons, and Enchanted Castles?—Airy Sprites, Terrestial Hob-goblins, and Infernal Demons, must, at a Word, descend, rise, and vanish. These things, justly introduc'd, strike an Awe upon the Audience; and, while they are amaz'd and delighted, they are instructed.[99]

The writers of pantomime did not neglect their opportunities to surprise and dazzle an audience. The opening scene of the Theobald-Rich *Harlequin a Sorcerer* indicates the possibilities present in the serious parts:

*After the Overture, the Curtain rises, and discovers dark rocky Caverns, by the Side of a Wood, illumin'd by the Moon: Birds of Omen promiscuously flying, Flashes of Lightning faintly striking.*[100]

*The Rape of Proserpine,* by the same authors, had a more spectacular scene:

*The Nymphs renew their Dance, and erect a Trophy in Honour to Jupiter, that is form'd of the Spoils of the Giants whom Jupiter overcame. An Earthquake is felt, and part of the Building falls; and, through the Ruins of the fall'n Palace, Mount Etna appears, and emits Flames. Beneath a Giant is seen to rise, and is dash'd to pieces by a Thunder-bolt hurl'd from Jupiter.*[101]

Occasionally the scene was designed to present horror and monsters. Weaver's *Perseus and Andromeda,* with the story of Medusa and the Gorgons, gave suggestions in the stage directions for the kinds of horror to be presented:

The Curtain Rises and Discover's *Medusa's* Cavern, *Medusa* and two *Gorgons* her Sisters reposing themselves in the Cave. Through the Rocks

---

[99] *Taste of the Town,* p. 80. Stress on scenes and effects had, of course, existed before the pantomimes became popular. Many of the musical masques had utilized them, and plays like the *Lancashire Witches* had also abounded in effects, as in Drury Lane, May 26, 1712, when the *Lancashire Witches* was advertised as "with the Original Decorations of Scenes, Dancings, Risings, Sinkings, and Flyings of the *Witches.*" (*Daily Courant,* May 26, 1712). In the Haymarket too, on March 28, 1717, *Cleartes* was given with two new scenes: one of a palace with a thousand yards of painting, the other a room with tapestry representing Alexander's battles (*Daily Courant,* March 28, 1717).

[100] Edition of 1725. This piece was revived in 1752; for a long account of its action then, see a reprint from the *Drury Lane Journal* in the *Gentleman's Magazine,* XXII (1752), 52-3.

[101] Fourth edition, 1727.

is discovered the Prospect of a Desolate Country, with Humane Figures Metamorphos'd into Stone by looking upon *Medusa*.

*Medusa* and the *Gorgons* dance, expressing a Horror at their Condition; *Minerva* having chang'd their Forms and turn'd their Hair to Snakes. . . .

The *Hours of Sleep* Enter and perform a Dance, then charm the *Gorgons* into a Profound Sleep.

While they are sleeping *Perseus* Enters, and after joining in a Dance with *Mercury*, receives from him a Sword. *Mercury* holds the Shield . . . while he severs *Medusa's* Head from her Body.

The *Gorgons* awake from their Sleep in great Terror, and Sink into the Earth at the Touch of *Mercury's Caduceus*. From the Blood of *Medusa* spring several Monsters, who seek for *Perseus* to devour him. . . .[102]

The grotesque parts of these pantomimes were, as a rule,[103] intrigue plots centered in the activities of Harlequin, Scaramouch, and Columbine; frequently the story was the wooing of Columbine by one or another of the *commedia dell'arte* characters. The grotesque part of *Cupid and Psyche* is probably typical of many. Columbine is being wooed by a Spaniard who sends her gifts by Pierot. Harlequin robs Pierot and courts Columbine, and the two plan to cheat her other lovers, a project which ends in success. Interspersed with this material is satire on Italian opera singers in the characters Mynheer Bassoon and Signior Trebelino, although many of the pantomimes, of course, contained no satire of any sort. This pantomime, appearing in 1734, also shows the influence of the ballad opera, for Pierot and the maid, as well as others, pause from time to time to sing ballads. In another similar pantomime, *Cephalus and Procris,* Harlequin and Columbine devote their time, energies, and trickery to eluding her brother, who wishes to separate them. To some extent, the influence of the Italian type of pantomime is seen in intrigue plots such as these.

Although these three types represent the main structural forms of the pantomime, they do not exhaust all the variety of subject matter which was used. Frequently the designers of the pantomimes were not content with the story of the farce, but introduced

[102] Edition of 1728. Weaver was apparently still attempting pantomimes after the ancient manner, for the stage directions here imply that action only was to be presented.

[103] Very frequently the published versions of these pantomimes omit the grotesque part, simply indicating where it would come. As a result, it is difficult to determine what the grotesque parts of many pantomimes were like.

occasional scenes which remained in the piece as long as there was any point to the novelty. It has already been pointed out that people like Mynheer Gargantua, the tall man, and Mrs. Webb, the tall woman, were introduced into the pantomimes as novelties. *Mist's Weekly Journal* told, perhaps untruthfully as a satiric thrust, of the addition to *The Necromancer* of a scene based on the widely spread report of the woman of Guilford who gave birth to nine rabbits and aroused much bitter controversy among the doctors.[104] Then too some of Rich's regular actions in his pantomimes were quite novel; some of them became classic stories in the history of pantomime. One observer commented in detail upon Rich's technique:

> . . . and on his last revival of the Sorcerer, I saw him practice the hatching of *Harlequin* by the heat of the Sun, in order to point out the business to Miles, who, tho' most excellent in the line of dumb significance, found it no easy matter to retain the lesson he had taught him.
>
> This certainly was a master-piece in dumb-shew. From the first chipping of the egg, his receiving motion, his feeling the ground, his standing upright, to his quick *Harlequin* trip round the empty Shell, through the whole progression, every limb had its tongue, and every motion a voice, which 'spoke with most miraculous organ' to the understandings and sensations of the observers.[105]

Some of the pantomimes, like Thurmond's *Harlequin Sheppard,* were based almost entirely upon contemporary material. One of the scandals of the time became the subject matter of one pantomime: *Father Girard the Sorcerer, or the Amours of Harlequin and Miss Cadiere.* Although the piece apparently was never published, the *dramatis personae* give some suggestion of the content of the farce, which was presented in Goodman's Fields, February 2, 1732.[106] In it were Father Girard (played by Rosco), Harlequin (by Giffard), Dominico (by Jenkins), Father Burn (by Miller),

[104] December 17, 1726. For some accounts of the report and the controversies, see *Mist's,* November 19, 1726, December 17, 1726, and January 7, 1727.

[105] John Jackson, *The History of the Scottish Stage* (Edinburgh, 1793), pp. 367-8. So many novelties of this sort occasioned a satiric announcement in *Pasquin,* Feb. 4, 1724, that the conjurer Fawkes, in despair, "has the Mortification to see himself out-done at both Play-Houses in the Mysteries of his own Art," and has decided to abdicate wholly in their favor.

[106] *Daily Post,* Feb. 2, 1732.

Lucifer (by Huddy), first Judge (by Bardin), second Judge (by Morgan), Father to Miss Cadiere (by Collett), Mrs. Cadiere (as Columbine, by Mrs. Roberts), Lady Abbess (by Mrs. Palmer), Mother of Miss Cadiere (by Mrs. Tollett) and Witches. In the next year Theophilus Cibber contributed a pantomime called *The Harlot's Progress; or, The Ridotto al' Fresco* (Drury Lane, March 31, 1733).[107] It was dedicated to Hogarth, on whose prints it was based. It was an elaboration, with songs and dancing, of the scenes and people Hogarth satirized. Still later, in 1736, two more topical pantomimes were produced. One was *The Worm Doctor,* with a new topical scene called *Harlequin Female Bone-Setter* (Lincoln's Inn Fields, October 9, 1736).[108] The scene was apparently a burlesque of some sort, with such characters as the Female Bone-Setter, Bandage, Callous, Vertebra, and Dislocation. The pantomime had a special performance on October 16, when Mrs. Mapp, "the famous Bone-Setter of Epsom," was to be present. The other topical pantomime was the more famous *Beggar's Pantomime; or, The Contending Columbines,* which satirized the controversy between Mrs. Clive and Mrs. Cibber as to which was to play the part of Polly in *The Beggar's Opera* (Lincoln's Inn Fields, December 7, 1736).[109]

These were not the only types of pantomimes which the theatergoers might see, for, competing with the English players, French and Italian comedians frequently came to London and produced French comedies, tragedies, and pantomimes. After the pantomime came into favor, there were few seasons when a company of foreign players was not making a stay in London. In some respects their performances were much like those of the English houses; their programs often consisted of a legitimate play followed (occasionally preceded) by a pantomime, with occasional dancing and acrobatics. But their pantomimes differed considerably from the English ones, for in those based on the French and Italian *commedia dell'arte,* the parts were speaking ones, and the foreigners furthermore rarely produced a pantomime which was a combination of serious and grotesque scenes in the manner of the

[107] *Ibid.*, March 31, 1733.

[108] *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, Oct. 9, 1736. See also *Gentleman's Magazine*, VI (1736), 617-8.

[109] For an account of this quarrel and the pantomime, see C. E. Pearce, *Polly Peachum* (New York, 1913), pp. 269-273.

English. A few of their plays were published in England, of which one, *The Two Harlequins,* printed in 1718, illustrates some differences between the foreign and the English type. This farce, which was written by Le Noble and printed in both French and English on opposite pages, has an intrigue plot in which there are two twins so much alike in appearance that they are constantly mistaken for each other. The elder Harlequin is a servant to Gerontes, who is courting Isabella. The latter's maid is Columbine, who, with Harlequin, acts as go-between for the couple. When Isabella declines to receive a present of jewels from Gerontes, she has Isabella return them. Columbine, by mistake, gives them to Harlequin Junior to return, but he keeps them. Harlequin Senior denies to Columbine and Gerontes that he has received the jewels. Then Gerontes sees them in the hands of Harlequin Junior and demands them, but Gerontes is taken for a cheat and is beaten. The mishaps continue until in the last scene the two Harlequins enter at the same time, and the mystery is cleared. On the whole, this play lacks the magic, scenes, machines, and startling events of the English pantomimes; it depends mainly upon the humor of the mistaken identities and upon the dialogue for its entertainment.[110] This type of foreign pantomime was rarely introduced by the English into their theaters during this period, possibly because the pantomimes they produced were so popular and often so profitable to the theaters that there was no need to import pantomimes from France or Italy.

The success of these entertainments, particularly the pantomimes, was undoubtedly great. In fact, the great development of all these varieties of entertainments seemed to many people to threaten the welfare and dignity of the stage and to endanger the dominant position which tragedy and comedy had normally held. Therefore, in the face of considerable public approval of panto-

[110] At least four other published versions of foreign pantomimes produced in London during this period are in the British Museum: *Argentina Strega per Amore, Arlechino Prencipe in Sogno, Le Disgratie d'Arlechino,* and *Le Furbarie per Vendetta,* all published in 1726. An account of the various groups of foreign comedians in London during this period remains to be written. Many of the visitors became associated with the English playhouses and actors after performing for awhile as a visiting troop, and, of course, many individual performers were apparently invited over to become dancers in Drury Lane or Lincoln's Inn Fields theaters.

mimes and novelties, many writers of prologues and epilogues, of leading articles in the periodicals, and of dramatic satires attacked the entertainments in the hope of lessening their importance in the theater. It was, for instance, against many of these theatrical innovations that Henry Fielding wrote some of his dramatic burlesques. But the condemnation and the satire of the entertainments which have been discussed here constitute another subject.

*Shurtleff College.*